

### ***REMARKS***

In the September 11, 2007 Office Action, claims 1-6 stand rejected in view of prior art. Claims 1-4 also were rejected for being directed to non-statutory subject matter. No other objections or rejections were made in the Office Action.

#### ***Status of Claims and Amendments***

In response to the September 11, 2007 Office Action, Applicants have amended claims 1-6 and added new claims 7-10 as indicated above. Thus, claims 1-10 are pending, with claims 1 and 4-6 being the only independent claims. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested in view of above amendments and the following comments.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §101***

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 for being directed to non-statutory subject matter. In response, Applicants have amended claims 1-4.

Specifically, Applicants have amended claims 1-4 to recite a computer readable medium which is encoded with a computer program for displaying a plurality of objects on a display unit of a video game device from a plurality of angles. Applicants respectfully assert that the claims now comply with 35 U.S.C. §101. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

#### ***Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102***

On pages 2-5 of the Office Action, claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Tiger Woods PGA Tour 2002 manual (EA Sports). In response, Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 4-6.

In particular, Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite that a reference point is selected from at least two points on a straight line linking a first object and a second object among the plurality of objects. EA Sports is cited in the Office Action to show that the camera view point movement function to move the camera viewpoint. However, Applicants respectfully assert that the camera viewpoint of EA Sports is annularly moved only around a golf ball. In contrast, the camera view point of the present application is selected from at least two points on the line linking the first and second objects. Applicants respectfully assert that this structure is *not* disclosed or suggested by EA Sports or any other prior art of record. It is well settled under U.S. patent law that for a reference to anticipate a claim, the reference must disclose each element of the claim within the reference. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, as now amended, is not anticipated by the prior art of record. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully assert that claims 4-6 are allowable for the same or similar reasons described above.

Moreover, Applicants believe that claims 2-3 are also allowable over the prior art of record in that they depend from independent claim 1, and therefore are allowable for the reasons stated above. Also, the dependent claims 2-3 are further allowable because they include additional limitations. Thus, Applicants believe that since the prior art of record does not anticipate the independent claim 1, neither does the prior art anticipate the dependent claims.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

#### *New Claims*

Applicants have added new claims 7-10. Applicants believe that claims 7-10 are also allowable over the prior art of record in that they depend from independent claims 1 and 5,

Appl. No. 10/540,584  
Amendment dated December 10, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of September 11, 2007

and therefore are allowable for the reasons stated above. Also, the dependent claims 2-3 are further allowable because they include additional limitations. Thus, Applicants believe that since the prior art of record does not anticipate the independent claims 1 and 5, neither does the prior art anticipate the dependent claims.

\* \* \*

In view of the foregoing amendment and comments, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 1-10 are now in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Todd M. Guise /  
Todd M. Guise  
Reg. No. 46,748

GLOBAL IP COUNSELORS, LLP  
1233 Twentieth Street, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20036  
(202)-293-0444  
Dated: December 10, 2007

S:\11-NOV07-AO\KC-US030807 Amendment.doc